

2972 Columbia St., #19690
Torrance, CA
USA 90503
Feb.6, 2013

Federal Communications Commission FCC 12-152

In the Matter of
Service Rules for the Advanced Wireless Services
H Block—Implementing Section 6401 of the
Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of
2012 Related to the 1915-1920 MHz and
1995-2000 MHz Bands

Dear Sir/Madame:

When cell towers were first set up in Europe, there was a legal case against the cell providers that their towers were causing cancer. The judge ruled that a health study was required. So a 10 year study was done. They found that no change in the cancer rate happened in the first 5 years; however, from years 5 to 10, the cancer rate dramatically increased (e.g., 10 times more in woman living within 1,000 ft of a cell tower than in the general population and 3 times more in men).

The German government asked the cell industry what they were going to do about it. So, the cell industry said, we need more studies. So, the government paid for 10 more studies under the guidance of the cell industry "experts". Every single one of those studies was shorter than 5 years (max. 3 years). In fact, there are no cell industry health studies to this day that are longer than 5 years. There are NO cell industry health studies to this day that are longer than 5 years, yet they are putting up more and more antennas and keeping them radiating for much longer than 5 years.

This Commission is planning to sell more frequencies. Are the sales to use these frequencies for use longer than 5 years?

Before the cell towers went up in the 1980's, cancers were not common place. Now, 50% of the population (50% of the population) are forecasted to get cancer. Today, it is common place for people to suddenly be called into the hospital and die within 2 weeks. Today, the cell towers have been up longer than 5 years, and without checks. I have read cell industry acknowledgement that their studies are only good for 3 years, but no acknowledgement that the cell towers need to be powered off after that until the industry has provides 10 and 15 year no-harm health studies.

I appreciate that Congress and the President have already passed a directive to sell; however, that directive can still be achieved with conditions.

1. For example, a condition of sale could be that min. 5% of the gross profits be invested into a Government fund which the Government distributes to 3rd party independent wireless health research for study of long term negative health effects for exposure from microwave

frequencies greater than 5 and 10 years.

2. Currently 3% of the population (over 9 million innocent US citizens) are hypersensitive to radiation. In other words, these people have either lost their jobs, lost their families, died, or had to move or make life-changing alterations to their living environment because of man-made radiation. In addition, 35% of the population are experiencing negative health effects from man-made radiation.

The Commission discusses business losses of cell providers but contains no acknowledgment of business losses of people hypersensitive to radiation. These people need a safe place to live.

Another condition of sale could be that

i) If the cell industry can not prove within 5 years that microwave frequency cell antennas are not negatively affecting the health of the general public after exposure for 10 years, they must stop use of these frequencies.

ii) During the first 5 years (until proof is shown to continue use),

a) 3% of the cities in the USA must remain free of transmitters within 15 miles of these cities from these frequency bands,

b) these "3% cities" would be required to be mutually agreed upon by the cell industry and governmentally acknowledged representatives of the hypersensitive to radiation community,

c) these "3% cities" must not have these frequency bands intentionally aimed there, and

d) these "3% cities" must remain free of these frequency bands such that the amplitude from man-made sources is less than 0.01 uW/m².

Over time, hopefully other frequencies can receive these same conditions, and those "3% of the cities" can become areas of refuge for citizens hypersensitive to radiation.

In terms of the request for comments about the Service Areas, the "reason" for selling these frequencies is to facilitate demand. Demand like that is only in the urban settings. Please spare the rural people who are trying to live healthier lives from having even more radiation poured upon them. I would like to suggest that there is no economic benefit to placing these frequencies in rural areas, as rural areas are already serviced by other frequencies. Please limit the Service Areas to only those where the demand can be justified, and only to urban areas during the first 5 years (until proof is shown to prove continued use does not affect people's health).

Thank-you in advance for your consideration of these very serious issues.

Michael Meszaros, M.Eng., P.Eng.